DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 455 EC 161 192

AUTHOR Kiraithe, Jackie
TITLE Second Language Acquisition: Implications for Assessment and Placement.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 19p.; Paper contained in "Special Education and the Bilingual Child." Proceedings of a Conference (Pasadena, CA, December 3, 1981), edited by Alberto M. Ochoa and Juan Hurtado. See EC 161 187.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Concept Formation; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Language Acquisition; *Limited English Speaking; *Second Language Instruction; Special Education; *Student Evaluation; *Student Placement

ABSTRACT

Research is reviewed on second language learning and implications for student assessment and placement of limited English proficient (LEP) students in special education are addressed. To support her contention that the most effective mode of instruction for an LEP child requiring special education should be within the framework of the child's own language and culture, the author cites research on the following topics: similarities and differences in the acquisition of first and second languages, transfer of concept development in the first language to the second language, differences in problems of second language acquisition versus learning disorders (language disorders present more complexity because they stem from a variety of sources), and reasons for greater benefits from special education in the child's native language (primarily for affective reasons). Needs for appropriate assessment instruments and instructional materials are noted. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED239455

SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: IMPLICATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT AND PLACEMENT

Dr. Jackie Kiraithe, Professor
California State University, Fullerton

Children who are not native speakers of English, and who may be totally dominant in another language or very limited in English, present an extraordinary challenge in the area of special education. Since the ability to receive and produce language is one of the primary requisites for success in any educational setting, the question of second language acquisition for such children is certainly one of the first priorities for consideration. In order to adequately address this concern. we must consider several major areas:

1. The development of a definition of the kind of language proficiency which is necessary for functioning successfully within the majority language population.

2. The kinds of assessment instruments and/or techniques and strategies which can help to determine whether the child is merely experiencing the expected kinds of difficulties in adapting to a new language and culture, or whether the child has a language disorder per se.

3. The kinds of instructional placement that would most adequately meet the individual child's needs.

This paper attempts to address these issues by outlining answers to certain specific, related questions.

Any careful discussion of the above considerations must remember that within the population of students from diverse language backgrounds who are limited in English proficiency, one encounters the same kinds of

EC161192

individual differences as are found among English speaking students. Children can range from those with an extreme academic orientation to those who are not functioning within the "normal" range because they have learning disabilities due to physical, psychological, or other factors. Each child, therefore, must be instructed in relationship to individual needs. A conglomerate lumping of non-English speaking children into one large category does not serve the needs of any of the children, because the limits of disability vary widely in individual cases.

As a result, the needs for special education for diverse language students are roughly equivalent to those for English speaking students, with the one seemingly insurmountable difference being that effectively reaching these students means we must find a way to communicate with them. Optimum learning for such students ideally would take place in an environment which provided bilingual instructors and a curriculum adapted to the individual linguistic needs of the students. Although some districts are beginning to recruit Spanish-English bilingual instructors to work in special education, the needs of students from other language backgrounds are not being met. Indeed, the vast majority of Spanish speaking children are not being served by existing programs. Among the notable efforts being made to bridge this gap are the PEOPLE (Pruebas de Expresión Oral y Percepción de la Lengua Española) test developed by the Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools under the direction of Sharon Mares, Program Manager, and the handbook, Instructional Modules, Bilingual-Bicultural Assistance to Special Education, developed by the San Diego County Department of Education under the direction of Katie Kane.

This author strongly advocates the position that the most effective mode of instruction for a child, who requires special education and who is clearly

dominant in a language other than English, should be within the framework of the child's own language and culture. Studies by Cummins (1980, 1981), Burt and Dulay (1972, 1973, 1974), Langdon (1977), Legarreta (1979), Krashen (1979) and numerous others, strongly support this stance in regard to the average child in an academic setting. Although there is to date insufficient literature in the field of special education about limited English proficient children, it can be posited that concept development will automatically be more successful in the only language the child understands and speaks. In addition, one cannot ignore the affective domain and its relationship to the special education child's enormous need for success--a need which can best be met in the child's own language.

Once it has been determined that the child is truly a candidate for special education, it is rather utopian to hope that the delivery of intensive English instruction will prepare the child with enough fluency so that English can be used as the medium for coping with any special needs. A child who is already experiencing tremendous difficulties within the academic framework is hardly one who will immediately learn English. Bull (1965) stated that to the extent that a child is capable of functioning in the child's own language, to that same extent will the child be capable of functioning in a second language, given appropriate motivation and instruction. In other words, a child whose own language functioning is limited, for whatever reason, will not function easily in English either. This view can be supported by Cummins' theory (1981) which states that the common underlying shared proficiencies in language build upon one another rather than being contained in separate storage units. It stands to reason, therefore, that the most effective means of meeting the special education and linguistic needs of the diverse language population is by providing bilingual strands within the special education program.

In order to develop that point of view, it is important to review some pertinent questions which relate to the basic concerns expressed above.

1. What are the similarities and differences in the development of L1 and L2?

There is a growing body of research on bilingual language acquisition. Most current reputable studies (e.g., Burt and Dulay, 1974; Krashen, 1979; Padilla and Lindholm, 1978) have established that the acquisition of elements in the second language closely parallels the order of acquisition for children who are developing that language as their first language. Multiple studies have documented that process for English (Bellugi and Brown, 1964; Bloom, 1970; Brown, 1973; Clark and Clark, 1979; McNeill, 1970).

That there are differences based on age, prior linguistic development, and prior development of literacy skills in terms of second language acquisition, is incontrovertible; nevertheless, the basic process rather closely parallels that of the young child. One frequently finds, therefore, that structures which are late in acquisition for native speakers of English also come later for the child acquiring English as a second language. An extremely simplified overview of first language acquisition would follow a sequence approximating the following:

1. Reception of the sounds of the language
2. Production of sounds of comfort and discomfort
3. Babbling and cooing stages
4. Listening discrimination and listening comprehension
5. Imitative stages, including intonation, pitch, rhythm
6. Analogic stages, including development of structures
7. One word, two word, and three word utterances
8. Kinesthetic language

9. Control of structural basics at approximately 5-6 years of age

10. Basic linguistic competence by the onset of puberty

The very important relationship between language and society plays a decisive role in the acquisition of L1. The child does not acquire language within a vacuum, but rather within the context of a family relationship, existing within a larger society, and demonstrating cultural patterning. Anthropologists and linguists have long been aware of the fact that it is impossible to separate language and culture, and that a child acquires not only the surface features of language, but also an underlying view of reality that corresponds to a cultural organizaton of the world. Included in that world are the language used at home; the availiability and type of reading materials at home; the exposure to television, radio and other entertainment; stories, rhymes, riddles, and myths; and the dialect(s) and level(s) of speech used in the home. For the child acquiring native language, therefore, the cultural and societal features are, in essence, built-in as the child acquires communicative competence and language reflecting the logic of the culture.

Second language acquisition displays close parallels to the basic processes of first language acquisition. There are certain important differences, however, which cannot be ignored. While L1 is <u>acquired</u>, L2 may either be <u>acquired</u> or <u>learned</u>, depending upon the circumstances. This is because the acquisition of L1 normally takes place within the context of the home and societal environment while the child is going through the normal developmental procedures. In contrast, L2 is most frequently developed upon exposure to the school environment and is learned/ acquired after the first language is established and after the normal early childhood development has taken place. There are exceptions to the last statement relative to children who live in

bilingual homes, or in terms of older learners who are exposed to new societies and who use their previously established linguistic abilities to develop a second language.

Other important differences include the following:

1. One does not repeat the stages of comfort and discomfort sounds, nor the stages of babbling and cooing.

2. Acquisition of L2 is built upon pre-existing linguistic and cognitive abilities.

3. Students acquiring a second language often display the ability to absorb and produce "global" patterns without understanding the structural basis of the individual words that form the utterance.

4. There is typically a large degree of interference on the phonetic level, although interference on grammatical levels is questioned by many linguists and language specialists.

5. Students frequently develop an "interlanguage" which is based on analogies either within L1 or L2, and which, in effect, is a developmental stage in the acquisition of L2.

6. The factors of age, maturity, and prior literacy skills contribute to different rates of acquisition of L2.

7. Intonation patterns and kinesthetic language may be so different in L1 and L2 that the student may need specific guidance in developing these elements of communication.

In view of the above, it becomes essential to determine whether a student who is experiencing difficulties in acquiring L2 truly needs a program of special education, or whether the child is in the developmental stages of acquiring a new language and culture. Tests such as the Language Acquisition Scales and the Bilingual Syntax Measure, provide helpful information about language dominance and proficiency; they do not assess whether or not the child has a learning disability or abnormal language development. This is problematic in view of the fact that the child may be experiencing difficulties because of a real learning handicap. A child's native language may not have

developed appropriately for age and school level because of various factors such as a noncommunicative home environment, inarticulate family members, or no prior educational experiences. The development of instruments such as PEOPLE, therefore, is highly desirable in order to appropriately determine the individual child's needs.

II. How does concept development in the first language transfer to the second language?

Practitioners in the educational field have long suspected that children with highly developed linguistic and academic skills (including competence and performance) in their own language make a relatively easy transition to English. Those who either have little linguistic proficiency or little academic preparation in L1 experience difficulties in L2 acquistion as well as in subject content areas at school. Current researchers have been validating and expanding this opinion.

James Cummins* is probably the individual who has most definitively analyzed the transfer of concept development from L1 to L2. His theories, in essence, hold that there is a "common underlying proficiency" as opposed to a "separate underlying proficiency," so that a bilingual's proficiency in L1 and L2 are seen as common and interdependent across languages (1981, pp. 23-25). In his research, Cummins has also specified that it takes a non-English speaker approximately two years to reach age-appropriate levels for context-embedded language and five to seven years to reach age-appropriate levels for context-reduced language. He describes context-embedded language as that language which is acquired with cues of some sort, such as situational language, visuals, pantomiming, basic conversational skills that develop naturally in the

*(Cummins' very important contributions to bilingual education in general cannot be readily reduced to a few paragraphs. It is recommended, therefore, that the interested reader go directly to the source.)

interplay of human activities, and so on. In contrast, context-reduced language is that kind of language which depends entirely upon knowledge of the language itself, in oral and/or written form, in order for comprehension to take place.

In light of Cummins' research, it appears imperative that children with special education needs be given the opportunity to develop, to the extent that they are capable, in the language that is most meaningful to them. Educators should have no fear that development of the native language will impede development of English. On the contrary, if one accepts the theory of the "common underlying proficiency," whatever is developed in L1 will become part of L2.

Linguists are also of the opinion that there are certain universals of language which are common to all languages. These universals include such categories as time, space, purpose, and location, which are expressed in every language, although each language expresses such concepts within the constraints of its own phonological and structural possibilities. Capitalizing on the theory of universals definitely strengthens the idea that a "common underlying proficiency" exists and works positively for a student acquiring L2.

Finally, we might examine the theory of competence-performance which has pervaded linguistic research. Competence refers to the underlying proficiency which exists, while performance relates to what is actually produced by the speaker. We are well aware that comprehension normally precedes production of language, and it is through comprehension that we develop the competence which will allow us to perform. Tyler (1978) has stated that since competence largely precedes performance and makes it possible, our learning to speak a language is simply the unfolding of a talent we already possess. He goes on to say:

> Because competence makes performance possible, we must have it--or at least its rudiments--before we have performance, and because competence makes performance understandable, we must have it before we can understand the performance of others. Therefore, a child who has access only to the performance of others, cannot learn language entirely from them. Without competence, this performance is simply mysterious to him and must ever remain so (1978, p. 36).

This would seem to strongly reinforce the concept that a child in a special education program who does not have competence in English can hardly be expected to have performance. Any attempts at remediation will only be the "performance of others"--unrelated to the child's world.

III. What are some differences in problems of second language acquisition vs. learning disorders?

For the classroom teacher or the special education practitioner, it is essential to be able to distinguish between the developmental stages of second language acquisition and the characteristics of language disorders. At first glance, there seem to be some gray areas which fit into both categories, such as unintelligible communication, discomfort on the part of the speaker, or conspicuous difficulties with phonology and/or sentence formation. A closer look, however, reveals distinct differences. For example, in both cases a student may display difficulty in hearing minimal differences in sound (i.e., sheep vs. ship). The L2 student, however, eventually will be able to identify pictures which represent the problem sounds, even though production of the appropriate phonemes may be delayed. In contrast, the child with a language disorder based on hearing loss, cerebral palsy, or even on low intelligence, may never hear the difference in those same sounds.

For purposes of brevity, the following list shows the characteristics of second language acquisition in contrast with those of language disorders.

Second Language Acquisition

1. The student must discriminate new sounds, know sounds in different combinations, and discriminate minimal differences in sounds which mark differences in meaning.

2. The student must develop the ability to articulate unfamiliar sounds or groups of sounds and to produce them in meaningful words, phrases, and sentences.

3. The student must learn new labels for familiar objects and realities as well as labels for realities or concepts which are not expressed in the native language.

4. The student must adapt to sentence structures which are different from those of the native language.

5. The student begins to make analogies based on both L1 and new information about L2.

6. The existence of underlying linguistic competencies facilitates transference from L1 to L2.

7. A form of "interlanguage" develops, in which errors may be seen as a stage of development in L2 analogous to early childhood language development of L1.

8. Intonation patterns and kinesthetic language may be vastly different in L2 and will require considerable practice in naturalistic language acquisition situations.

9. Difficulties are predictable in the area of linguistic organization of cultural reality due to differences between L1 and L2.

The following list contains some elements which are similar to those problems listed for second language acquisition. It will be seen, however, that language disorders present far more complexity because they stem from a variety of sources. In addition, individuals differ in degrees of dysfunction so that given individuals may have proportionately many or few problems. The child displaying the difficulties listed below is definitely a candidate for a special education program.

Language Disorders

1. The child is unable to hear and discriminate sounds because of hearing loss, cerebral palsy, or other health-impairing conditions.

2. The child experiences difficulties in articulation, including omissions, additions, distortions, and substitutions. If articulatory difficulties are linked to hearing loss, the gap widens with age and the child produces rather peculiar vocal qualities.

3. The child may not have labels for common objects and may not have the underlying concepts because of low intelligence or impaired speech and hearing.

4. Speech may be unintelligible and disordered, or may be produced with obvious pain for the speaker.

5. The child may demonstrate immature behavior or low intelligence even in nonverbal tasks.

6. The child's memory may be poor or nonexistent for short-term memory, and may be exceedingly sporadic for long-term memory.

7. There is a demonstrated need for preseveration (constant repetition) in order for the child to grasp new words or concepts even momentarily.

8. The child may demonstrate difficulties in generalization and the ability to apply information to new situations.

9. Expressive language may be difficult, delayed, or immature and may include such factors as speech which is too slow or too fast; language which is inappropriate for the age of the child; vocal qualities which are inappropriate for the age of the child; vocal qualities which are innapropriately high or low, or loud or soft in relationship to the age and size of the child.

10. The child may stutter.

It is important to mention that certain organic dysfunctions are high on the list of those which contribute to language disorders. Chief among these is hearing loss which, although frequently occurring in individuals of normal intelligence, cause deficits in verbal language and speech skills, as well as difficulties in following directions, and which frequently causes a child to appear inattentive. Cerebral palsy also affects language production strongly,

in terms of difficulty with articulation, pitch, intensity, quality, rhythm, and fluency. A child with cerebral palsy may actually appear to be in pain when trying to produce speech. Depending upon other physiological factors, a cleft palate may or may not cause articulatory problems. Mental retardation is closely linked to language disorders. Children who are orthopedically handicapped or who suffer from other health impairing conditions do not necessarily experience language disorders, but they may also suffer from such problems if there are psychological affects linked to the physical problem.

Given the above lists of problem areas, it is essential to turn our attention to the most effective means of remediation for children who are experiencing language disorders.

IV. Why is special education more beneficial in L1?

Perhaps the first and most significant factor to be considered in the discussion of why special education is more beneficial in L1 is the affective domain and its interplay with the cognitive domain. It is generally recognized that special education children suffer from the stigma of feeling worthless, from peer disapproval, from parental pressures, and so on. When they feel inadequate and inferior, their cognitive abilities are lessened. The old adage which states that "success breeds success" is highly applicable in these cases. Because L1 is the language of the home and consequently the language of love and emotional content, it appears obvious that one can reach the child and potentially facilitate success more readily in the most familiar language, even though that language may be minimally developed. The most straight-forward question is: If one cannot communicate with the child, what can possibly be remediated? As Krashen succinctly states in Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework (1981), the key to learning is the comprehensibility of the input, one cannot learn what one cannot understand.

Cummins declares:

> Instruction through L1 is regarded as much more than an interim carrier of subject matter content; rather it is the means through which the conceptual and communicative proficiency that underlies both L1 and English literacy is developed (1981, p. 41).

In any attempt to make input comprehensible to the learner, the specific objectives of such input must be known to the instructor/facilitator. Researchers and educators alike must know the parameters of language skills which are needed for both basic communication skills and cognitive academic language tasks. It is true that certain special education students may not reach an academic level of functioning; others may be helped toward that goal by careful development of native language skills.

Kiraithe (1978, 1980) made a comprehensive review of language testing instruments and basic texts for teaching language. From that review, the following list of essential language skills for success in school and in life was developed and simplified:

1. Control of phonology on receptive and productive levels.
2. Ability to recognize and produce statements, questions, exclamations, and commands.
3. Ability to recognize and produce concepts related to past, present, and future events.
4. Ability to recognize and produce singular and plural forms, according to the linguistic constraints of L1.
5. Reception and use of basic adverbial phrases.
6. Reception and use of basic adverbial forms.
7. Reception and use of true prepositions and prepositions that are used as particles with verbs to alter meanings.
8. Recognition and use of color words for activities of visual perception, labeling, sorting, and classifying.

9. Sequential counting as a transfer skill for sequencing in mathematics, sciences, social studies, and most importantly, reading.

10. Recognition and production of pronominal forms, including subject, object, and possessive pronouns.

Many of these essential skills are not present in the language of special education students. In order for such students to achieve even a modicum of success in the academic environment, whichever of these skills that may be lacking must be emphasized in the development of specific objectives for the individual student. Additionally, as far as the technology of special education is concerned, the same kinds of methods and strategies used to facilitate learning for the English speaking child are effective techniques for L1 remediation. Based on research cited throughout this paper, maximum results will be achieved if these skills are developed first in L1 and then become an integral part of the underlying competency for L2. Informal observation by Kiraithe in various schools districts throughout California strongly substantiates this view.

Conclusions

Further research is definitely needed in the area of bilingual special education to clarify such concerns in language acquisition as (1) the kinds of concept transfer and application which occur under specific conditions of dysfunction and disability, (2) the levels of language proficiency which can be developed in various types of special education students, (3) the determination of which students would most benefit from instruction in L1, and (4) the appropriateness of instruction in L1 and L2.

Other specific needs include (1) the development of appropriate language tests for diagnosis and assessment in diverse languages, (2) the training of linguistically appropriate educators to work with different language populations, (3) the development of bilingual individualized learning programs to

meet the language needs of special education students, and (4) the establishment of flexible groupings in regular classrooms as well as in special education programs to meet individual student needs.

In spite of the acknowledged deficits in research and appropriate assessment instruments and instructional materials for bilingual special education, there are reasons to be optimistic about the future. Research with average students is the basis of Cummins' common underlying proficiency model. Other evidence is accumulating to indicate that self-esteem grows as L1 proficiencies are developed and it continues to grow as L2 is acquired, thus meeting needs within the affective and the cognitive domains. We can, at this point, only hypothesize (albeit rather strongly!) that the bilingual mode is the most effective means of facilitating learning for special education students who clearly are extremely limited English speakers.

REFERENCES

Asher, J. Learning a Second Language Through Actions. Los Gatos, California: Sky Oaks Productions, 1975.

Bellugi, U. and R. Brown, eds. The Acquisition of Language. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Bloom, L. Language Development: Form and Function in Emerging Grammars. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1970.

Brown, D. "Affective Variables in Second Language Acquisition," Language Learning, 23 (2), 1973, pp. 231-244.

Brown, R. A First Language: The Early Stages. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Bull, W. E. Spanish for Teachers, Applied Linguistics. New York, New York: Ronald Press, 1965.

Burt, M. and H. Dulay. "Goofing: An Indicator of Children's Second Language Learning Strategies," Language Learning, 22 (2), 1972, pp. 235-252.

Burt, M. and H. Dulay. "New Perspectives on the Creative Process in Child Second Language Acquisition," Language Learning, 24 (2), 1974, pp. 253-278.

Burt, M. and H. Dulay. "Should We Teach Children Syntax?," Language Learning, 23 (2), 1973, pp. 254-258.

California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education. Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework. Los Angeles, California: California State University, Los Angeles, 1981.

Canale, M. and M. Swain. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing," Applied Linguistics, I, 1980, pp. 1-47.

Clark, E. and H. H. Clark. "Universals, Relativity and Language Processing," in J.H. Greenbert, ed. Universals of Human Language, Vol. I of Method and Theory. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1979, pp. 225-278.

Cummins, J. "The Entry and Exit Fallacy in Bilingual Education," NABE Journal, 4 (3), 1981, pp. 25-60.

Cummins, J. "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students," in Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework. Los Angeles, California: California State University, Los Angeles, 1981.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Erwin, S. "Changes with Age in the Verbal Determinants of Word Associations," American Journal of Psychology, 74, 1961, pp. 361-372.

Frankel, I. and A. J. Tymchuk. "Digit Recall of Mentally Retarded and Non-retarded Children under Three Presentation Rates." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 79, 1974, pp. 311-319.

Galyean, B. Language From Within. Long Beach, California: Kenzel, 1976.

Gili-Gaya, S. Estudios de Lenguaje Infantil. Barcelona, Spain: Bibliografía Departamento Editorial, 1974.

Gonzalez, G. "The Acquisition of Grammatical Structures by Mexican-American Children," in E. Hernandez-Chaves, et al., eds., El Lenguaje de los Chicanos. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Hallahn, D. P. and J. M. Kauffman. Exceptional Children: Introduction to Special Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1978.

Keller-Cohen, D. "Systematicity and Variation in the Non-Native Child's Acquisition of Conversational Skills," Language Learning, 29 (1), 1979, pp. 27-44.

Kiraithe, J. M. "A Framework for Teaching English Reading to Bilingual Students," in 1980 Claremont Reading Conference 44th Year Book. Claremont, California, 1980, pp. 206-217.

Kiraithe, J. M. " If Kids Can Say It, the Battle's Half Won," REACH I (2), 1978, pp. 44-49.

Kiraithe, J. M. Second Language Continuum and Management System, 1982 (in press).

Krashen, S. D., M. A. Long, and R. C. Scarcella. "Age, Rate and Eventual Attainment in Second Language Acquisition," TESOL Quarterly, 13, (4), 1979, pp. 573-582.

Lado, R. Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1971.

Langdon, H. Determining a Language Disorder in a Bilingual Spanish-English Population. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Boston University, School of Education, September, 1977.

Langdon, H.W. and H.S. Sherman-Wade. Instructional Strategies: Teaching Methodology to Match Diagnosed Needs to Desired Outcomes of I.E.P. Sacramento, California: California State Department of Education, 1980.

Magiste, E. "The Competing Language Systems of the Multilingual: A Developmental Study of Decoding and Encoding Processes," Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 18 (1), 1979, pp. 58-64.

Matluck, J. and B. Mace. "Language Characteristics of Mexican-American Children: Implications for Assessment," Journal of School Psychology, 11 (4), 1973, pp. 365-385.

McNeill, D. The Acquisition of Language: The Study of Developmental Psycholinguistics. New York, New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Mykelbust, H.R. Learning Disabilities: Education Principles and Practices. New York, New York: Greene and Stratton, Inc., 1967.

Padilla, A. and K. Lindholm. "Child Bilingualism: Report on Language Mixing, Switching, and Translations," Linguistics, 211, 1978, pp. 23-44.

Saville-Troike, M. Bilingual Children, A Resource Document. Arlington, Virginia, Center for Applied Lingusitics, 1973.

Slobin, D. I., ed. A Field Manual for Cross Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence. Berkeley, California: Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, 1967.

Slobin, D. I. Psycholinguistics. Palo Alto, California: Scott Foresman and Company, 1978.

Tyler, S. R. The Said and the Unsaid: Mind, Meaning and Culture. New York, New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Wagner, D. A. "The Development of Short Term and Incidental Memory: A Cross-Cultural Study," Child Development, 45, 1974, pp. 389-396.

Wiig, E. H. and E. M. Semel. Language Disabilities in Children and Adolescents. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.